UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,210	03/16/2007	Giuseppe Diomelli	51579	3444
	7590 12/16/200 ABRAMS, BERDO &	EXAMINER		
1300 19TH STREET, N.W. SUITE 600 WASHINGTON,, DC 20036			HOQUE, NAFIZ E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		2614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/16/2009	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/596,210	DIOMELLI, GIUSEPPE	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	14/11/2 2:110002	2014
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 30 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07( Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing data	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externation Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water MENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further colling</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		,
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al  non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	lowable if submitted in a separate,	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowance because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
/Ahmad F Matar/	/NAFIZ E HOQUE/	
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614	Examiner, Art Unit 2614	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants arguments filed on 11/30/09 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1 and 20, Applicant argues "Malik reference substantially concerns a software (CIR) dedicated to help a single user manage all the communications related to the communications devices (both data and voice) owning only to that user (arguments, page 16)" and "Applicant recites the system and method wherein the Communications Devices and/or Terminals can be those associated with different users, located at any number of different locations, and which are able to connect, by the internet and a standard browser, to a server".

In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "can be those associated with different users") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Furthermore, claim 1 recites "permitting one or more users to transmit and receive synchronous and asynchronous communication". Therefore, it could be interpreted for using only one user.

Furthermore, Applicant argues that Malik and Nelson "fail to describe at least a system and method wherein all the communications devices' inbound and outbound communications are initiated, received, controlled and managed by using the web browser of the device by communicating with a web services section of the single central processor or network server, that also provides the distinct communications channels".

In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Nelson discloses communications devices' inbound and outbound communications (col. 7, lines 39-45 - initiate calls and receive calls) are initiated, received, controlled and managed by using the web browser of the device by communicating with a web services section (col. 1, lines 61 - col. 2. lines 3 - initiated, received, controlled and managed by the web browser) of the single central processor or network server, that also provides the distinct communications channels (fig. 3 - discloses making calls 102 and using email 106, therefore it provides "distinct communication channels")

In conclusion, Malik and Nelson disclose the system and method of the instant application and Examiner maintains the finality of the last office action.